

equipment or technology. And so these nations did not have to do what the intelligence community thought they had to do, and that was to develop it indigenously, from the ground up, with only what the nation could produce. They have been very successful in acquiring technology from other countries which has naturally shortened the lead time for them to develop and deploy their own systems.

Finally, and very importantly, the Rumsfeld Commission realized that foreign nations are aggressively pursuing denial and deception programs, thus reducing our insight into the status of their missile programs. In effect, what the Rumsfeld Commission concluded is this: That while the CIA in its estimate provided to us based its conclusions, in effect, on only what it could prove it knew, which, of course, is very little in the intelligence world, the Rumsfeld Commission examined what we knew and then asked questions about what the implications were about what we knew.

Would it be possible, even though we have no evidence that a country has done certain things, that it could do so as a result of what we knew? And if our assumptions with respect to its intentions are correct, would it not be plausible to assume that they would try to do that; and if they tried to do it, might they succeed?

So questions like that were asked in ways that were not based upon hard evidence in all cases but plausibilities and possibilities, and, as a result of asking those questions, some very troubling conclusions were reached which in many cases were verified by certain confirming evidence. And that is why we now understand that the nations with which we are most concerned have much more robust systems, both with respect to the missiles for delivery of weapons and the weapons on top of the missiles, than we had ever thought before.

Second, these programs can be deployed with little or no warning. And third, and probably the key lesson to come out of this, we have to appreciate the fact that we will be surprised by surprises, but we should not be. We should not be surprised by surprises, because most of what these countries are doing we don't know, and we won't know until the weapon is used or it is finally tested and we realize that they have developed it or we find information in some other way that confirms a program that we previously did not know existed.

So instead of being surprised at surprises, the Rumsfeld Commission report says we need to get into a new mode of thinking to understand that we should not be surprised by surprises, and that we should base our policy on that understanding.

That is my concluding point, Mr. President. The Congress and the President, in setting national policy, in developing our missile defenses, in appropriating the funds to support those pro-

grams, should approach this with the understanding that we will have little or no advanced warning, that there is much that we don't know but that we are likely to be facing threats. Therefore, my conclusion is we have got to get on with the development of our missile defenses. That represents my three concluding points. No. 1, we have got to get on with the job of developing and deploying both theater missile defenses and a National Missile Defense System, and we can begin by voting for cloture and for the Cochran-Inouye bill when we return from the recess.

Second, we must improve our intelligence capabilities and resources.

And third, we must avoid arms control measures and diplomatic actions that impede our ability to defend ourselves and damage our intelligence sources and methods.

We have a lot of work to do. Those of us on the Intelligence Committee have committed ourselves, based upon the briefing of the Rumsfeld report, to begin working on the intelligence aspects of this problem, and those who are on the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committees will also have to work toward correction of the problems of the past to assure that our missile defense programs can proceed with the speed that is required to meet these emerging threats.

I conclude by thanking the members of this bipartisan Rumsfeld Commission and suggest to all of my colleagues that they become familiar with the contents of its report because it should certainly guide us in our policy deliberations with respect to the security of the United States from a missile threat in future years.

Mr. ENZI addressed the Chair.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

GLOBAL WARMING ESTIMATES

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I would like to take a couple of minutes to talk about global warming and about where we are in the process of getting information from the administration about the Kyoto Treaty.

Last year, when we were doing appropriations, the Senate unanimously adopted an amendment to the Foreign Operations spending bill. That amendment directed the White House to describe exactly the amounts and locations of all its planned expenditures for domestic and international climate change activities for 1997, 1998, and thereafter. The President signed that bill.

What I hoped to get was a list, by agency, with their expected costs and objectives. I thought the Office of Management and Budget would be able to easily locate the pots of money involved in something as critical to the administration as global warming. But the President's response was a 2-page letter describing the Climate Change Technology Initiative and the Global Change Research Program. I have got-

ten more information out of any issue of the newspaper. No numbers were included in the global change research section. No numbers were included showing the money the Department of State has spent negotiating climate change or supporting the U.N.'s scientific bodies. No numbers were included telling us how much "indirect programs" would cost.

The administration's letter was an unacceptable response to our request, and it took a year to get it.

I ask unanimous consent to have that letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
March 10, 1998.

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with section 580 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998, I herewith provide an account of all Federal agency climate change programs and activities.

These activities include both domestic and international programs and activities directly related to climate change.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

In response to Section 580 of Public Law 105-118, "Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of FY 1998," the following is a summary of Federal agency programs most directly related to global climate change.

DOMESTIC PROGRAMS

The Climate Change Technology Initiative is a five-year research and technology program to reduce the Nation's emissions of greenhouse gases. Led by the Energy Department (DOE) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the initiative also includes activities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and the Departments of Agriculture (USDA) and Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The initiative includes a combined \$2.7 billion increase over five years for these agencies for research and development on energy efficiency, renewable energy, and carbon-reduction technologies. The initiative also includes \$3.6 billion in tax incentives over five years to stimulate the adoption of more efficient technologies in buildings, industrial processes, vehicles, and power generation.

The Global Change Research Program, led by the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, builds understanding of climate change and variability, atmospheric chemistry, and ecosystems. The scientific results from the program help in the development of climate change policies, and the development of new observing systems will enable better monitoring of future climate changes and their impacts. For example, the Tropical Rainfall Measuring Mission satellite launched during 1997 will provide previously unavailable, detailed, and accurate rainfall measurements, filling a significant gap in our understanding of the Earth system. In 1998 and 1999, the program will launch more satellites and increase its focus on investigating regional climate changes and assessing the vulnerability of the U.S. to climate variability and change.

A more complete description of these programs can be found in Chapter 6 ("Promoting Research") of the President's FY 1999 Budget.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

Last June, the President announced a \$1 billion, five-year commitment to address climate change in developing countries. This

initiative includes at least \$750 million (\$150 million per year) for the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to support climate change-related activities in developing countries, particularly programs in energy efficiency, forestry, and agriculture. USAID will also use up to \$250 million of its new credit authority to provide partial loan guarantees for projects in developing countries that address climate change.

The Global Environment Facility (GEF) is the world's leading institution for protecting the global environment and avoiding economic disruption from climate change, extinction of valuable species, and collapse of the oceans' fish population. The \$300 million proposed for 1999 includes \$193 million for U.S. contributions previously due and \$107 million for the initial contribution to the GEF's second four-year replenishment (1999 to 2002). Approximately 38 percent of the total U.S. annual contribution to the GEF supports climate change-related projects in developing countries.

The State Department supports the work of the UN framework Convention on Climate Change Secretariat and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)—the single, most authoritative, international scientific and technical assessment body with respect to climate change. Many nations rely on the IPCC for information and assessment advice on climate change.

INDIRECTLY RELATED PROGRAMS

Several Federal agencies conduct programs that are indirectly related to global climate change. For example, the Department of Defense conducts research to improve energy efficiency of military aircraft as a means of improving defense capability. The Department of Transportation conducts research that can lead to improved vehicular traffic flow and reduced fuel consumption. By promoting energy efficiency, these programs can also help reduce the Nation's emissions of greenhouse gases. Nevertheless, since the primary focus of these programs is not on climate change, the Administration does not consider them to be "climate change programs and activities," as stipulated in Section 580 of the Foreign Operations bill.

Mr. ENZI. Since that time, other Members of Congress have been trying diligently to track down these budget numbers. I have tried to get questions answered. I have followed up on administration statements. It has not been easy. The House Government Reform Committee has been forced to issue three subpoenas and has threatened a fourth. In response to those, the administration has made some documents available, but some are still waiting for White House Counsel approval.

I, too, have encountered obstacles in trying to see those cost numbers. Earlier this year, Janet Yellen, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, testified twice in the House that Kyoto would cost American families only \$90 per year—only \$90 per year. Estimates from independent economic consulting firms, however, show vastly different numbers. These estimates put costs as high as \$2,100 per household per year. Most people that I know think that \$90 a year would be a lot of additional tax; \$2,100 would be unconscionable. That is a \$2,000 difference per year on what it will cost to solve the problem the administration says we have.

The obvious question is, Why are they so far apart? Why are the White

House numbers so low? The Department of Energy places the cost of reducing 1 ton of carbon emissions at \$130 to \$150, to cut to 1990 levels. The White House uses \$171 per ton, to go 7 percent below 1990. If you add it up, the cost is over \$100 billion per year, not adjusted for inflation. Factor in inflation and divide by households. The fact is, that \$90 per family is not realistic.

When Ms. Yellen was asked how they came up with the \$90, her answer was that the assumptions and models were a national security secret.

I asked for a copy of those documents. I was told that they were a national security secret. I pointed out that when you get elected to this body, you get a top secret clearance. You are supposed to be able to view all documents necessary to your work. I offered that, if they were so busy that they couldn't deliver those numbers to the Capitol, that I would be happy to go down to the White House and look at those numbers. After some weeks, they did say they might send a few numbers up.

I asked the Counsel of Economic Advisers nominee, Rebecca Blank, if she could get me a copy. I held up the nomination until they could produce them. I got a series of runs and explanations, but certain critical parts were missing. In fact, what I got is a table of contents with formulas, and no explanation.

I was also curious to know what part of these documents had been so secret. They were delivered by an intern from the White House to my office, not given to me personally, not stamped "confidential." There was no stamp on them whatsoever to designate how important these were to national security. So I had to suspect that I had not gotten the documents that we had been talking about.

I asked about it. I got an interesting response. I would like to share part of that with my colleagues.

The White House Counsel's Office is concerned that public disclosure of these materials would set an unfortunate precedent that could chill the free flow of internal discussions essential to effective decision making. Counsel believes that such disclosure is not necessary for purposes of Congressional oversight.

In other words, we don't deserve the information. We should not be a part of that. We don't need to know. And letting us know would damage the Executive's ability to make decisions.

We are the policy body of the United States. Only with FDR did the President start traveling all over the country, and all over the world, trying to set legislation. That has gone on, on an ever-increasing basis, since that time. It is our job to pass the laws. The laws set the policy. The White House is the management branch of this Government. And they say that our information would interfere in their decision-making, it would have a chilling effect.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the letter from the Executive Of-

fice of the President be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,

Washington, DC, July 29, 1998.

Hon. MICHAEL B. ENZI,
U.S. Senate, Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR ENZI: I understand that you would like me to elaborate on the views I expressed during my testimony before Congress regarding public disclosure of the documents that were relied on in preparation of my testimony on the economic implications of the Kyoto Protocol. It is also my understanding that you are specifically interested in the reasons why public disclosure of these documents would not be useful to U.S. interests in ongoing international negotiations.

The economic materials relied on in the preparation of my testimony reflect internal deliberations of the Executive Branch, and in particular, of the President's economic advisers. Nonetheless, we provided these documents to you and several House Committees, expressly on the basis that they not be made public. We did so in an effort to accommodate the legitimate oversight needs of Congress while preserving the President's interest in the confidentiality of Executive Branch deliberations. The White House Counsel's Office is concerned that public disclosure of these materials would set an unfortunate precedent that could chill the free flow of internal discussions essential to effective Executive decision making. Counsel believes that such disclosure is not necessary for purposes of Congressional oversight.

In addition, disclosure of some of these documents would not be helpful to the position of the United States in ongoing international negotiations. The documents reveal Administration assessments of the costs of options that are the topic of ongoing negotiations in international fora. We prefer that other countries participating in those negotiations not have access to such materials.

I appreciate your consideration of our views on this matter. Please let me know if you have any other questions or need additional information.

Sincerely,

JANET L. YELLEN.

Mr. ENZI. I do disagree with that. I think the public does have a right to know. What is the point in hiding the information? What is the White House afraid that people might find out? I have a hunch it is all about jobs. The study conducted by DRI-McGraw-Hill estimated Kyoto could cost us 1.5 million jobs. Charles River Associates puts that figure as high as 3.1 million jobs by 2010.

Even the Argonne National Laboratory pointed to job losses in a study on the impact of higher energy prices on energy-intensive industries. Argonne concluded that 200,000 American chemical workers could lose their jobs. All of the American aluminum plants could close, putting another 20,000 workers out of work. Cement companies would move another 6,000 jobs overseas. And nearly 100,000 United States steelworkers would be out of work.

Americans have a right to know what is going on. They have a right to know if it is going to cost them their job.

Mr. President, I ask for a few additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, even if the Office of White House Counsel doesn't think so, they should have a chance to see who is playing with their livelihoods.

In spite of the White House position, the Secretary of Interior had the nerve to call energy companies "un-American in their attempts to mislead the American public." Remember, they are the only ones disclosing figures. They are the only ones from whom you can get the model, all of the math, and an explanation. They are the ones sharing data.

The Secretary of Interior had the nerve to call them "un-American in their attempts to mislead the American people." He further asserted that they were engaged in "a conspiracy to distort the facts." They are the only ones sharing facts.

I will repeat that. They were called "un-American in their attempts to mislead the American people." There are a lot of people working in coal and oil fields in my State, over 20,000 of them. Mr. President, 20,000 people is 6 percent of all the people working in Wyoming. More important, it is over 10 percent of the private sector employees.

These are the people who work for energy companies. These are the people Mr. Babbitt claims are "un-American." I think they are worried about their jobs. They are worried about laying off their employees. They are worried about their own families and all the other families who survive in our towns because of energy production. As an industry, these people are worried about a treaty that can force them to lay off over a million Americans. It could force industry to lay off half of their employees in Wyoming.

On the other hand, the Executive Office of the President finds that, "public disclosure would set an unfortunate precedent" and that it "is not necessary for purposes of Congressional oversight." I ask just who is misleading the American people?

There is something else I want to bring to the attention of this body. In spite of the fact that the President has firmly stated that this treaty will not be implemented before ratification, right now the Environmental Protection Agency has undertaken an effort to manipulate the Clean Air Act to enact it. I think we deserve to know what other branches of Government are currently working behind the scenes, behind our back, to make changes through Executive orders or rules and regulations that put a treaty into place that this body would not ratify. If it were brought here today, it would not be ratified. It violates everything in the resolution that we adopted, sending signals to the people who went to Kyoto to negotiate on behalf of the United States.

There has been no public input. I think the administration does not want public input on climate change. I know they don't want to look at the science, but I think they also don't want public input. If they wanted input, this letter from the Executive Office wouldn't say what it does. If the White House wanted the public to know all the details about the treaty, they would send it to the Senate and America, and they would let us debate it. They would tell the American people what they are planning to do.

My only experience in the executive branch was as mayor of a boom town. But I can tell you, when I was trying to pass the smallest bond issue or when I was working on negotiations on industrial siting, figuring out what the companies that were coming to our counties would have to do to participate in the growth of our town so we could have orderly growth, if I would not have shared on a regular basis more information, more detail, more explanation for those little things than what the President is doing with us on this big thing, I would not have been able to do any of them, and I should not have been able to do any of them.

It is the duty of the executive branch to inform the people who make the decisions legislatively, to provide them with all of the information that can possibly be provided and not just to send out a group of numbers with no explanation, a bunch of abbreviations with no explanation. We don't need a table of contents. We don't need a bunch of math. We need answers. We need to know the formulas, and we need to be able to have people who understand those numbers take a look at them.

This is not national security. This is a need for the American public to know, and the American public in this case probably ought to start with the U.S. Senate. We do have the kind of authority that we should be able to get the numbers, and if the President wants cooperation from us, he will provide those numbers. We can take them the way he wants. We can take them in secret, but I hope they will share them with us and with the American public.

SACAJAWEA ON THE DOLLAR COIN

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong support for the selection of an image of Sacajawea for the new one dollar coin. The Dollar Coin Design Advisory Committee recently recommended to the Treasury Secretary that the new dollar coin bear a design inspired by Sacajawea. On July 29th, the Treasury Secretary announced that he was accepting the Committee's recommendation. I am pleased that the committee and the Treasury Secretary have recognized the important role of Sacajawea in the history of our Nation.

I do believe that it is important, however, that the coin explicitly honor and bear a likeness of Sacajawea. The

actual language of the committee's recommendation is that the coin should bear a design of "Liberty represented by a Native American woman, inspired by Sacajawea and other Native American women." This language is a bit vague, but it does make it clear that Sacajawea is their symbolic choice. I strongly urge the Treasury Secretary to approve a final design that is based on a historically accepted image of Sacajawea. There are several images that could be used, and I will be happy to share them with the Secretary.

Mr. President, I am distressed to learn that a bill has been introduced in Congress that would overturn the recommendation and subsequent acceptance of the depiction of Sacajawea on the new one dollar coin. As we know, Congress specifically refrained from mandating a design for the coin when we passed the authorizing legislation. This was to ensure that political pressures would not affect the decision-making process. Instead, the Treasury Secretary appointed the Dollar Coin Design Advisory Committee, which was specifically charged with coming up with a design for the coin, subject to some general guidelines from the Secretary. The selection process of the advisory committee emphasized citizen participation. After a thorough and open debate, the committee voted 6-1 to recommend Sacajawea for the dollar coin. Unfortunately, that whole process could be undermined by the bill that has been introduced. We are beyond debating the merits of Sacajawea or the Statue of Liberty. Arguments against her image obviously were not persuasive. I see no reason for Congress to attempt to impose its will and reverse a decision that was made by an unbiased panel based on extensive input from the American people.

Mr. President, I sent a letter to the Treasury Secretary earlier this month requesting that he accept the committee's recommendation of Sacajawea for the new one dollar coin. In that letter, I outlined some of the reasons that I think she would be a great choice for the coin. I would like to briefly discuss these reasons right now.

As most Americans know, Sacajawea was an integral part of the Lewis and Clark expedition, the story of which is an incredible tale of adventure, determination, cooperation, and persistence. When Lewis and Clark set out for the West, they had no idea what they might find in the coming months or how long they would be gone. Anyone who has traveled through the West has to be in awe of what the Lewis and Clark expedition was able to accomplish. It is remarkable that Sacajawea was just a teenager with an infant when she endured the rigors of this trip into uncharted territory.

The importance of Sacajawea to the Lewis and Clark expedition can not be understated. Her knowledge of the land and its resources helped the expedition survive the rugged terrain of the West.